



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,146	09/30/2003	Thomas D. Ray III	066575-0011	3833

7590 08/16/2004

DYKEMA GOSSETT, PLLC
Third Floor West
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HQGE, GARY CHAPMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3611

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
AUG 27 2004
GROUP 3600

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,146

Applicant(s)

RAY ET AL.

Examiner

Gary C Hoge

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/30/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, printing operation (claim 14), the die-cutting operation (claims 14 and 22), the separation of the third layer into a usable product matrix and waste product matrix, and discarding the waste product matrix (claim 23), the die-cut extending through the magnet but not the backing layer (claim 24), the automatic application of the clean release magnet to a product (claim 25), the postcard mailer (claim 26), and the machine for performing the printing and affixing (claim 27) must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, it is not clear whether two options (clear with printing, opaque with printing) or three options (clear, opaque, with printing) are intended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 14-23, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Charley.

See Fig. 2 and column 2, lines 25-67. Charley discloses a method comprising the steps of printing information on a label layer **14** having adhesive, thereby denoting a first layer; affixing a pressure sensitive carrier layer **24**, having a clean-release adhesive **20** on a first surface and an adhesive **26** on a second surface, to a magnet layer **12** to thereby denote a second layer; and affixing the first layer to the second layer (Fig. 2) to denote a third layer, and cutting the third layer to a predetermined depth (see column 4, lines 1-13). The magnet layer is non-tacky when removed from the pressure sensitive carrier layer.

Regarding claim 15, the adhesive **26** is a permanent adhesive.

Regarding claim 16, the adhesive applied to the label layer **14** makes the label layer self-adhering.

Regarding claim 17, see column 1, line 67.

Regarding claim 18, every solid object is either flexible or rigid.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, the pressure sensitive carrier layer **24** is clear. See column 2, line 36.

Regarding claim 21, the pressure sensitive carrier layer has a releasable backing layer 28 affixed thereto.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, see column 4, lines 8-12.

Regarding claim 25, see column 5, lines 21-25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charley.

Charley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including the step of die-cutting the finished labels. The cut must not extend all the way through the labels, because the labels are wound onto a roller 110 after die-cutting, which would be impossible if the cut completely separated the labels into discrete pieces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the cut all the way through the magnet,

Art Unit: 3611

but stop short of cutting the backing layer, because the precise depth of the cut is an obvious matter of design choice.

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charley in view of Martin.

Charley discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Charley discloses attaching the magnet label to a cereal box. Martin teaches that it was known in the art to attach a magnet label to a postcard, in order to mail the magnet to the user. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach the magnet label disclosed by Charley to a postcard, as taught by Martin, in order to mail the magnet label to the user.


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C Hoge whose telephone number is (703) 308-3422. The examiner can normally be reached on 5-4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (703) 308-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gary C Hoge
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

gch

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION

(Use several sheets if necessary)

PTO Form 1449

Attorney Docket No.: 066575-0004

Application No.: 40/180,084

Applicant: Thomas D. Ray, III, et al.

Filing Date: June 27, 2002

Group: 1734

10/673,146

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*Examiner Initial	Provided	Document Number	Date	Name	Class	Sub Class	Filing Date
GAH	Yes	6,410,309 B1	Jun. 25, 2002	Barbera-Guillem et al.			
GAH	Yes	2002/0081446	Jun. 27, 2002	Boudouris et al.			
GAH	Yes	6,428,869	Aug. 6, 2002	Ozgen et al.			
GAH	Yes	6,472,037	Oct. 29, 2002	Kane			
GAH	Yes	6,153,279	Nov. 28, 2000	Charley			
GAH	Yes	4,310,978	Jan. 19, 1982	Stern			
GAH	Yes	6,113,148	Sep. 5, 2000	Koranda et al.			
GAH	Yes	5,699,956	Dec. 23, 1997	Brennan			
GAH	Yes	6,039,356	Mar. 21, 2000	Warther et al.			
GAH	Yes	2002/0086138	Jul. 4, 2002	Iijima			
GAH	Yes	2001/0042590	Nov. 22, 2001	Neuburger			
GAH	Yes	6,436,520	Aug. 20, 2002	Yamamoto			
GAH	Yes	6,153,280	Nov. 28, 2000	Uffmann			
GAH	Yes	5,984,091	Nov. 16, 1999	Orr et al.			
GAH	Yes	5,868,498	Feb. 9, 1999	Martin			
GAH	Yes	5,769,457	Jun. 23, 1998	Warther			
GAH	Yes	5,702,778	Dec. 30, 1997	Andonian			
GAH	Yes	6,273,660	Aug. 14, 2001	Ozgen et al.			
GAH	Yes	5,458,282	Oct. 17, 1995	Martin			
GAH	Yes	5,589,021	Dec. 31, 1996	Bloom			
GAH	Yes	5,641,116	Jun. 24, 1997	Martin			
GAH	Yes	5,676,307	Oct. 14, 1997	Martin			

FOREIGN PATENTS/APPLICATIONS

*Examiner Initial	Provided	Document Number	Date	Name	Class	Sub Class	English Translation
GAH	Yes	9-212095	15 Aug. 1997	--	--	--	Yes
				--	--	--	

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

Examiner

Gary Hoge

Date Considered

8/7/04

Examiner: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.